

SEATTLE MULTIMODAL TERMINAL AT COLMAN DOCK PROJECT**DRAFT RFFP Q&A #2****April 24, 2015**

Question/Comment	Date received	Response
<u>GENERAL REQUIREMENTS</u>		
There are a significant number of references to WSDOT related issues in the General Requirements that aren't relevant to the Colman Dock project but if the intent is to create a document that can be used as a foundation for future WSDOT Heavy-Civil GC/CM projects then cleaning them up to be more project specific isn't really necessary.	4/17/2015	Without specific references to the clauses in question it is difficult to answer this question.
As stated above we could clean up some of the irrelevant language that is a hold-over from the source document but we could do that during contract negotiations if WSF wanted to do that.	4/17/2015	If there are any specific clauses that would affect the Final Proposal please provide specific comments and rationale on any provisions that you believe to be irrelevant.
<u>FINAL PROPOSAL FORM</u>		
It will be important for bidders to have Attachment A at bid time, clearly defining project roles that are considered "Key Staff". That document wasn't shared with us at this point, so we can't comment on that definition. If they are defined as the Key Staff defined in the RFQ then that point should be clear.	4/17/2015	Attachment A will be provided as part of the RFFP.
Your inclusion of a lump sum price for supplemental staff continues to concern us. It is a practice that most of the industry has evolved away from and only a couple of agencies still use. It is very difficult to quantify staffing needs until phasing strategies and shift requirements are better defined. We believe a GC/CM best practice is to establish billing rates for all staff up front, with a project specific staffing plan and schedule negotiated after award.	4/17/2015	We believe that the best value to the taxpayers is to allow proposers to develop their own approach and pricing for key and supplemental staff needed to provide the scope of services as part of their Specified General Conditions pricing.

If you elect to continue to pursue the lump sum bid price for staff on the final proposal form then it would be appropriate to confirm the 65 month schedule applies to that number as well.	4/17/2015	Duration for supplemental staff will be included on the proposal form.
If you can establish a basis for required multiple shifting that would be helpful as well.	4/17/2015	The basis for multiple shifting is specified in 00 21 16 3.2.3 Key Personnel Specified General Conditions.
<u>PRECONSTRUCTION SCOPE OF WORK</u>		
Under Task 4.1 Deliverables (page 16/27) it states that the 30% Master Schedule is to be delivered within 30 days of receipt of the 90% design review package. We assume that it is intended that this deliverable is within 30 days of the 30% design review package.	4/17/2015	Correct, this will be addressed in the RFFP.
Under the "General" Heading page 1/27 the last paragraph states "Note: A Construction Management and Contracting Plan (CMACP) is required for MACC Negotiations per 39.10.370 (7). The GC/CM will not be reimbursed for preparation of this plan, schedules, estimates, or for MACC negotiations." We have not seen this language before in any GC/CM contract and the RCW's do not state that this is not to be reimbursed. We request that the second sentence be deleted and development of the CMACP should be reimbursed under the preconstruction agreement.	4/17/2015	This will be addressed in the RFFP Preconstruction Scope of Work and Preconstruction Work Plan. CMACP preparation up through 90% design will be negotiated as part of preconstruction services; modifications to the CMACP, schedule and budget during (and in support of) MACC negotiations will not be reimbursed.
<u>MATRIX OF COST ALLOCATION</u>		
Builder's Risk Insurance premiums are time and scope driven. In that neither of those variables for the project are known at this time, it would be better for WSF to carry these costs as NSS. This is generally an industry standard for most GC/CM projects in recent years, specifically for this reason.	4/17/2015	While we have provided a duration of 1325 working days and an estimated MACC of \$177M, we will move this to NSS.
We don't see 1-04.3(9) "Work during Commissioning" on the matrix. It probably should be and is usually considered NSS.	4/17/2015	Concur; provision of a Test Engineer by the Contractor during "Commissioning" will be a Negotiated Support Service.

Under Specified General Conditions category 9.g. it states that the Field Office is to be part of the lump sum General Conditions. This will be difficult to estimate at this stage of the project and would request that it be moved to NSS.	4/17/2015	This will be moved to NSS.
<u>ATTACHMENT C – WSF PRECONSTRUCTION WORK PLAN</u>		
We won't know the EC/MC CM personnel at the time this work plan is prepared and we'd want input from the selected firms prior to finalizing this plan. We could estimate time for positions or this part of the form should be excluded from the initial document.	4/17/2015	We will include a not to exceed budget for EC/CM and MC/CM preconstruction services which would be developed with the selected GC/CM at the time of award of the preconstruction agreement. We will work with the GC/CM to formalize the budget with the selected EC/CM and MC/CM subcontractors following their selection if EC/CM and MC/CM are selected.
In general the 15 day period to prepare progress estimates for a project of this size and complexity appears very aggressive.	4/17/2015	This will be addressed in the negotiation of the preconstruction services scope of work.